arXiv:math-ph/0405048v3 11 Mar 2005

A CHARACTERIZATION OF THE AERTS PRODUCT OF HILBERTIAN LATTICES

BORIS ISCHI

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ be complex Hilbert spaces, $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ the lattices of closed subspaces, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be a complete atomistic lattice. We prove under some weak assumptions relating $\mathcal{L}_i$ and $\mathcal{L}$, that if $\mathcal{L}$ admits an orthocomplementation, then $\mathcal{L}$ is isomorphic to the separated product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ defined by Aerts. Our assumptions are minimal requirements for $\mathcal{L}$ to describe the experimental propositions concerning a compound system consisting of so called *separated* quantum systems. The proof does not require any assumption on the orthocomplementation of $\mathcal{L}$.

1. Introduction

In their 1936's founding paper on quantum logic, Birkhoff and von Neumann postulated that the lattice describing the experimental propositions concerning a quantum system is orthocomplemented (see [3], §9). We prove that this postulate forces the lattice $\mathcal{L}_{sep}$ describing a compound system consisting of so called *separated* quantum systems to be isomorphic to the separated product defined by Aerts in [1].

By separated we mean two systems (electrons, atoms or whatever) prepared in different "rooms" of the lab, and before any interaction take place. Recall that the state of a two-body system S can be either entangled or a product state. Any non-product state violates a Bell inequality [5], hence for separated systems as defined above, the state of S is necessarily a product. Whether the two systems are fermions or bosons does not matter. Since they are prepared independently and do not interact, they are distinguishable and not correlated.

It is important to note that our result does not require any assumption on the orthocomplementation of $\mathcal{L}_{sep}$. Instead, following Piron [10] and Aerts [1], we assume $\mathcal{L}_{sep}$ to be complete and atomistic. Moreover, we need some assumptions relating $\mathcal{L}_i$ and $\mathcal{L}_{sep}$ that translate the fact that $\mathcal{L}_{sep}$ describes a compound system. Such minimal conditions have been settle and studied first by Aerts and Daubechies (see [2], §2), and later by Pulmannová [11, 12] and Watanabe [13, 14]. We will see in Section 4 that our assumptions are much weaker than those of previous works. In Section 2 we recall the definition of the separated product. In Section 3 we introduce our assumptions by defining what we call $\mathsf{S}-$products. The main result is proved in Section 6, whereas an important preliminary result concerning automorphisms is established in Section 5.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 06C15, 06B23; Secondary 81P10.

Key words and phrases. Quantum logic, compound system, ortholattice.

Supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

2. The separated product

For terminology concerning lattice theory, we refer to [9]. We adopt the following notations. If $\mathcal{L}$ is a complete atomistic lattice, and a an element of $\mathcal{L}$, then $\mathcal{A}(a)$ denotes the set of atoms under a, and $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ denotes the set of atoms of $\mathcal{L}$. If $\mathcal{L}$ is moreover orthocomplemented, then we denote the orthocomplementation by $a \mapsto a^{\perp}$. For atoms, we write $p \perp q$ if $p \leq q^{\perp}$. Finally, the top and bottom elements are denoted by 1 and 0 respectively.

Definition 2.1 (D. Aerts, [1])**.** Let $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ be complete atomistic orthocomplemented lattices. On $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ define the following binary relation: $p\#q$ if and only if $p_1 \perp_1 q_1$ or $p_2 \perp_2 q_2$. Then,

$$\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2 := \{R \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)\,;\; R^{\#\#} = R\}\,.$$

Remark 2.2. Obviously, $\#$ is symmetric, anti-reflexive and *separating* (*i.e.* for all $p \neq q$, there is r with $p\#r$ and $q \not\# r$), therefore $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ is a complete atomistic lattice, the mapping $a \mapsto a^{\#}$ of $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ into itself, where $a^{\#} = \{p \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)\,;\, p\#q,\, \forall q \in a\}$, is an orthocomplementation, and atoms of $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ are singletons of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$. Moreover, coatoms are given by

$$\{(p_1, p_2)\}^{\#} = \mathcal{A}(p_1^{\perp_1}) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2) \;\cup\; \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(p_2^{\perp_2})\,.$$

Hence, it is an easy exercise to prove that

$$\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2 = \{\cap\omega\,;\, \omega \subseteq \{\mathcal{A}(a_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(a_2)\,;\, (a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{L}_1 \times \mathcal{L}_2\}\}\,. \tag{2.1}$$

For complete atomistic lattices $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$, we define $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ by (2.1).

3. S−products

For our main result (Theorem 6.4), we need to make some hypotheses on $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$, which are true if $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_2)$, with $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ complex Hilbert spaces. However, we consider a more general setting in order to point out exactly the assumptions on $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ needed for the proof.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a complete atomistic lattice. We write $\mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$ for the group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{L}$. We say that $\mathcal{L}$ is *transitive* if the action of $\mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ is transitive. We denote by 2 the lattice with two elements. If $\mathcal{H}$ is a complex Hilbert space, then $\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the lattice of closed subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathsf{U}(\mathcal{H})$ stands for the group of automorphisms of $\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H})$ induced by unitary maps.

Remark 3.1. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space. Then $\mathsf{U}(\mathcal{H})$ acts transitively on $\mathcal{A}(\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}))$.

Definition 3.2. A complete atomistic lattice $\mathcal{L}$ is *weakly connected* if $\mathcal{L} \neq 2$ and if there is a *connected covering* of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, that is a family of subsets $\{A^{\gamma} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})\,;\, \gamma \in \sigma\}$ such that

1. $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}) = \cup\{A^{\gamma}\,;\, \gamma \in \sigma\}$ and $|A^{\gamma}| \geq 2$ for all $\gamma \in \sigma$,
2. for all $\gamma \in \sigma$ and for all $p \neq q \in A^{\gamma}$, $p \vee q$ contains a third atom,
3. for all p, $q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, there is a finite set $\{\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_n\} \subseteq \sigma$ such that $p \in A^{\gamma_1}$ and $q \in A^{\gamma_n}$, and such that $|A^{\gamma_i} \cap A^{\gamma_{i+1}}| \geq 2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

Remark 3.3. Note that in part 2 of Definition 3.2, it is not required that the third atom under $p \vee q$ is in A^{γ}. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a complete atomistic lattice. If $\mathcal{L}$ is weakly connected, then $\mathcal{L}$ is irreducible (see [9], Theorem 4.13). On the other hand, any complete atomistic orthocomplemented irreducible lattice $\mathcal{L} \neq 2$ with the covering property (for instance $\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\mathcal{H}$ a complex Hilbert space with $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \geq 2$) is weakly connected. Indeed, in that case, for any two atoms p and q of $\mathcal{L}$, $p \vee q$ contains a third atom, hence $\{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})\}$ is a connected covering.

Definition 3.4. Let $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be complete atomistic lattices and let $h_1 : \mathcal{L}_1 \to \mathcal{L}$ and $h_2 : \mathcal{L}_2 \to \mathcal{L}$ be injective maps preserving all meets and joins. For $a_1 \in \mathcal{L}_1$, $a_2 \in \mathcal{L}_2$, $A_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ and $A_2 \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 \otimes a_2 &:= (h_1(a_1) \wedge h_2(a_2)), \\ a_1 \overline{\otimes}\, a_2 &:= \{p_1 \otimes p_2\, ;\, p_1 \in \mathcal{A}(a_1),\, p_2 \in \mathcal{A}(a_2)\}, \\ a_1 \overline{\otimes}\, A_2 &:= \{p_1 \otimes p_2\, ;\, p_1 \in \mathcal{A}(a_1),\, p_2 \in A_2\}, \\ A_1 \overline{\otimes}\, A_2 &:= \{p_1 \otimes p_2\, ;\, p_1 \in A_1,\, p_2 \in A_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.5. Since h_i preserves arbitrary joins and meets, h_i also preserves 0 and 1. Therefore, $h_1(a_1) = h_1(a_1) \wedge h_2(1) = a_1 \otimes 1$ and $h_2(a_2) = h_1(1) \wedge h_2(a_2) = 1 \otimes a_2$. Moreover, $0 \otimes a_2 = 0 = a_1 \otimes 0$ for all $a_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$.

Definition 3.6. Let $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be complete atomistic lattices, with $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ weakly connected, and let $h_1 : \mathcal{L}_1 \to \mathcal{L}$ and $h_2 : \mathcal{L}_2 \to \mathcal{L}$ be injective maps preserving all meets and joins. Suppose that $p_1 \otimes p_2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, for all $(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$.

We say that $\mathcal{L}$ is *laterally connected* if there is a connected covering $\{A_1^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \sigma_1}$ of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ and a connected covering $\{A_2^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \sigma_2}$ of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$, such that for all $\gamma_1 \in \sigma_1$ and $\gamma_2 \in \sigma_2$, and for all $q_1 \otimes q_2$, $r_1 \otimes r_2 \in A_1^{\gamma_1} \overline{\otimes}\, A_2^{\gamma_2}$ with $q_1 \neq r_1$ and $q_2 \neq r_2$, there is $(\exists)$ $p = p_1 \otimes p_2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ such that both lateral joins $p_1 \otimes q_2 \vee p_1 \otimes r_2$ and $q_1 \otimes p_2 \vee r_1 \otimes p_2$ contain a third atom.

In case $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathsf{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ (respectively $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathsf{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$), we require moreover that for any atom $p_1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ (respectively $p_2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$), there is $(\exists)$ $q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ (respectively $r \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$) such that $p_1 \otimes q \vee p_1^{\perp_1} \otimes q$ (respectively $r \otimes p_2 \vee r \otimes p_2^{\perp}$) contains a third atom.

Definition 3.7. Let $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be complete atomistic lattices with $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ weakly connected. Let $T_i \subseteq \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_i)$. We write $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbf{C}_{T_1 T_2}(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2)$ if

(P0) there exist two injective maps $h_i : \mathcal{L}_i \to \mathcal{L}$ preserving all meets and joins,
(P1) $p_1 \otimes p_2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, $\forall p_i \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_i)$,
(P2) $p_1 \otimes p_2 \leq a_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes a_2 \Leftrightarrow p_1 \leq a_1$ or $p_2 \leq a_2$, $\forall p_i \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_i)$, $a_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$,
(P3) $\mathcal{L}$ is laterally connected,
(P4) for all $u_i \in T_i$, there is $u \in \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$ such that $u(p_1 \otimes p_2) = u_1(p_1) \otimes u_2(p_2)$, $\forall p_i \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_i)$.

We call $\mathcal{L}$ a $\mathsf{S}_{T_1 T_2}-$*product* if $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbf{C}_{T_1 T_2}(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2)$ and

(P5) $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}) = \{p_1 \otimes p_2\, ;\, (p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)\}$.

Remark 3.8. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a $\mathsf{S}-$product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$. If $\mathcal{L}_1 = 2$, then $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{L}_2$, and if $\mathcal{L}_2 = 2$, then $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{L}_1$. By Axiom P5, the u of Axiom P4 is necessarily unique. We denote it by $u_1 \otimes u_2$. By Axioms P4 and P5, if T_1 acts transitively on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ and T_2 acts transitively on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$, then $\mathcal{L}$ is transitive. Therefore, if T_1 and T_2 contain the identity, then the $\exists$ in Definition 3.6 can be replaced by $\forall$. Finally, note that Axiom P3 requires that only some lateral joins of atoms contain a third atom.

The proof of the following proposition is left as an exercise.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ be complex Hilbert spaces. Then* $\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2) \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathsf{U}(\mathcal{H}_1)\mathsf{U}(\mathcal{H}_2)}(\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_1), \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_2))$.

Remark 3.10. Let $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ be complete atomistic lattices. Note that from (2.1) we find that lateral joins of atoms in $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ are given by $\{(p_1, p_2)\} \vee \{(p_1, q_2)\} = \{p_1\} \times \mathcal{A}(p_2 \vee q_2)$ and $\{(p_1, p_2)\} \vee \{(q_1, p_2)\} = \mathcal{A}(p_1 \vee q_1) \times \{p_2\}$. Moreover, let $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$. Then, $\vee\{\mathcal{A}(a) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)\,;\, a \in \omega\} = \mathcal{A}(\vee\omega) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ be complete atomistic weakly connected lattices. Then, $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ is a $\mathsf{S}_{T_1 T_2}-$product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ with $T_i = \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_i)$.*

Proof. Define $h_1 : \mathcal{L}_1 \to \mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ as $h_1(a_1) := \mathcal{A}(a_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$, and $h_2 \to \mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ as $h_2(a_2) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(a_2)$. From the preceding remark, h_1 and h_2 obviously preserve arbitrary meets and joins, and Axiom P3 holds. Moreover, by definition (see (2.1)), Axioms P5 and P2 hold.

Finally, let u_1 be an automorphism of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and u_2 an automorphism of $\mathcal{L}_2$. Define a map u on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ as $u(p_1, p_2) = (u_1(p_1), u_2(p_2))$. Then, for all $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{L}_1 \times \mathcal{L}_2$, we have that

$$u(\mathcal{A}(a_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(a_2)) = \mathcal{A}(u_1(a_1)) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(u_2(a_2))\,.$$

Moreover, u preserves arbitrary set-intersections, hence induces an automorphism of $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$. □

Remark 3.12. Given two complete atomistic weakly connected lattices with the covering property $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$, there are many $\mathsf{S}-$products of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ different from $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ [7] (note that Axiom P3 in [7] is stronger than Axiom P3 here).

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be complete atomistic lattices. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\mathsf{S}-$product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$. Let $p_1 \otimes p_2$, $q_1 \otimes q_2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, $a_1 \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and $a_2 \in \mathcal{L}_2$. Suppose that $p_1 \neq q_1$, $p_2 \neq q_2$ and that $p_1 \leq a_1$ and $p_2 \leq a_2$. Then*

1. *$p_1 \otimes p_2 \vee q_1 \otimes q_2$ contains no third atom,*
2. *$\mathcal{A}(p_1 \otimes a_2 \vee a_1 \otimes p_2) = p_1 \overline{\otimes} a_2 \cup a_1 \overline{\otimes} p_2$.*

Proof. (1) First,

$$p_1 \otimes p_2 \vee q_1 \otimes q_2 \leq (p_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes q_2) \wedge (q_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes p_2)\,.$$

Now, from Axioms P2 and P5 we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}((p_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes q_2) \wedge (q_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes p_2)) &= (p_1 \overline{\otimes} 1 \cup 1 \overline{\otimes} q_2) \cap (q_1 \overline{\otimes} 1 \cup 1 \overline{\otimes} p_2) \\ &= \{p_1 \otimes p_2, q_1 \otimes q_2\}\,.\end{aligned}$$

(2) First,

$$p_1 \otimes a_2 \vee a_1 \otimes p_2 \leq a_1 \otimes 1 \wedge 1 \otimes a_2 \wedge (p_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes p_2)\,,$$

and by Axioms P2 and P5,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}(a_1 \otimes 1 \wedge 1 \otimes a_2 \wedge (p_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes p_2)) &= a_1 \overline{\otimes} a_2 \cap (p_1 \overline{\otimes} 1 \cup 1 \overline{\otimes} p_2) \\ &= p_1 \overline{\otimes} a_2 \cup a_1 \overline{\otimes} p_2\,.\end{aligned}$$

□

4. $\mathsf{S}-$PRODUCTS AND SEPARATED QUANTUM SYSTEMS

In this section we discuss and compare our Axioms listed in Definition 3.7 with those of previous works.

Let $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be complete atomistic orthocomplemented lattices. In [2, 11, 12, 13, 14] it is required for $\mathcal{L}$ to describe a compound system that

(l0) $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ are orthomodular,
(p0) there exists two injective maps $h_i : \mathcal{L}_i \to \mathcal{L}$ preserving the orthocomplementation and all meets and joins,
(p1) $p_1 \otimes p_2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, $\forall p_i \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_i)$,
(p2) for all $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{L}_1 \times \mathcal{L}_2$, $h_1(a_1)$ and $h_2(a_2)$ commute.

Obviously, Axiom p1 is identical to Axiom P1 and Axiom p0 implies axiom P0. On the other hand, from Axioms l0, p0, p1 and p2 follows that $p_1 \otimes p_2 \leq h_1(a_1) \vee h_2(a_2)$ if and only if $p_1 \leq a_1$ or $p_2 \leq a_2$. [*Proof*: The proof is very similar to the proof of Lemma 1 in [12]. Let $S = \{h_1(p_1), h_2(p_2), h_1(a_1), h_2(a_2)\}$. From Axiom p2, for all $T \subseteq S$ with $|T| = 3$, there is $a \in T$ such that a commutes with all $b \in T$. Therefore, since $\mathcal{L}$ is orthomodular, the sublattice generated by S is distributive [6]. Suppose that $p_2 \wedge a_2 = 0$. Then,

$$p_1 \otimes p_2 \leq (h_1(a_1) \vee h_2(a_2)) \wedge h_2(p_2) = a_1 \otimes p_2 \vee 1 \otimes (a_2 \wedge p_2) = a_1 \otimes p_2 \,.$$

Let $u : \mathcal{L}_1 \to \mathcal{L}$ be defined as $u(a) = a \otimes p_2$. By Axiom p1, $u(a) = 0$ implies $a = 0$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{L}$ is orthomodular, the map * from the sublattice $[0, h_2(p_2)]$ into itself defined as $x^* = x^\perp \wedge h_2(p_2)$ is an orthocomplementation, and $[0, h_2(p_2)]$ is orthomodular. Hence, from Axiom p0, $u(a^{\perp_1}) = h_1(a)^*$. On the other hand, by Axiom p2, $u(a)^* = (h_1(a_1)^\perp \vee h_2(p_2)^\perp) \wedge h_2(p_2) = h_1(a)^*$ [6].

As a consequence, since $u(p_1) \leq u(a_1)$, we find that $u(p_1) \wedge (u(p_1) \wedge u(a_1))^* = 0$, therefore $p_1 \wedge (p_1 \wedge a_1)^{\perp_1} = 0$; whence, since $\mathcal{L}_1$ is orthomodular, $a \wedge p_1 = (a_1 \wedge p_1) \vee (p_1 \wedge (p_1 \wedge a_1)^{\perp_1}) = p_1$, that is $p_1 \leq a_1$.]

As a consequence, Axioms l0, p0, p1 and p2 imply Axiom P2. Therefore, from Axiom p0, we find that $p_1 \otimes p_2 \leq (q_1 \otimes q_2)^\perp$ if and only if $p_1 \perp_1 q_1$ or $p_2 \perp_2 q_2$. Hence, from Axioms l0, p0, p1, p2 and P5, we find that $\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$, which by Lemma 3.11 is a $\mathsf{S}-$product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ if $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are weakly connected.

In [7, 8] we proved a similar result as here. However, the proof in [8] requires an axiom relating the orthocomplementations of $\mathcal{L}_i$ and $\mathcal{L}$, whereas in [7] we used an axiom P3 stronger than Axiom P3 here.

We now make some comments about our axioms. Let $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ with $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ complex Hilbert spaces, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be a complete atomistic lattice describing the experimental propositions concerning a compound system S consisting of two separated quantum systems S_1 and S_2, described by $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ respectively.

As mentioned in the introduction, since S_1 and S_2 are separated, Axiom P5 holds. On the other hand, Axiom P2 can be justified easily (see [1] or [8] for details), and Axioms P0 and P4 with $T_i = \mathsf{U}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ are indeed very natural.

Axiom P3 is more delicate. At a first glance, it may appear technical. However, there is a simple physical reason why $\mathcal{L}$ should be laterally connected. Indeed, it is natural to assume that there is a map $\omega : \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}) \times \mathcal{L} \to [0, 1]$ which satisfies at least the two following hypotheses:

(A1) $\omega(p, a) = 1 \Leftrightarrow p \leq a$,
(A2) $\omega(p_1 \otimes p_2, a_1 \otimes a_2) = g(p_1, a_1) g(p_2, a_2)$,

with $g(p,a) = \|P_a(v)\|^2$, where P_a denotes the projector on a, and v is any normalized vector in p. Hence, for all atoms p_1, $p \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ and p_2, r, $s \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$, such that $r \perp_2 s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(p_1 \otimes p_2, p \otimes (r \vee s)) &= g(p_1,p)g(p_2, r \vee s) \\ &= g(p_1,p)(g(p_2,r) + g(p_2,s)) \\ &= \omega(p_1 \otimes p_2, p \otimes r) + \omega(p_1 \otimes p_2, p \otimes s)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

On the other hand, for any two orthogonal atoms r and s of $\mathcal{L}_2$, there is an experimental proposition P on S_2 such that P is true if the state of S_2 is r and false if the state is s. Now, P is a proposition concerning the compound system S, and obviously for any atom p of $\mathcal{L}_1$, P is true if the state of S is $p \otimes r$ and false if the state is $p \otimes s$. Therefore, as for propensity maps (see [4] or [10], §4.2), it is natural to assume that

(A3) $r \perp_2 s \Rightarrow \omega(p_1 \otimes p_2, p \otimes r \vee p \otimes s) = \omega(p_1 \otimes p_2, p \otimes r) + \omega(p_1 \otimes p_2, p \otimes s)$.

From Axioms A1, A3 and Eq. (4.1), we obtain that for all atoms p of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and r, s of $\mathcal{L}_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} r \perp_2 s \;&\Rightarrow\; [\omega(p_1 \otimes p_2, p \otimes r \vee p \otimes s) = \omega(p_1 \otimes p_2, p \otimes (r \vee s)),\ \forall p_1 \otimes p_2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})] \\ &\Rightarrow p \otimes r \vee p \otimes s = p \otimes (r \vee s)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Now, for $i = 1$ and $i = 2$, let

$$f_i : \{V \in \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_i)\,;\, \dim(V) = 2\} \to 2^{\mathcal{A}(\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_i))}\,,$$

such that for all V in the domain of f_i, $f_i(V)$ is a maximal set of mutually orthogonal atoms in $V^{\perp_i}$. Moreover, for any two atoms p and q, define $A_i^{pq} := \{p\} \cup f_i(p \vee q)$. Suppose that $\dim(\mathcal{H}_i) \geq 4$. Let p and q be atoms. Then, $p \in A_i^{pq}$, $q \in A_i^{qp}$ and $|A_i^{pq} \cap A_i^{qp}| \geq 2$. Therefore, $\{A_i^{pq}\,;\, p, q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_i))\}$ forms a connected covering of $\mathcal{A}(\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_i))$. Moreover, from (4.2), $\mathcal{L}$ is laterally connected.

5. Automorphisms of S−products

In this section, we show that automorphisms of S−products factor. We will use this result in the proof of our main result (Theorem 6.4).

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be complete atomistic lattices, with $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ weakly connected and transitive. Let $T_i \subseteq \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_i)$ acting transitively on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_i)$ with $\mathsf{id} \in T_i$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\mathsf{S}_{T_1T_2}$−product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$. Then, for any $u \in \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$, there is a permutation ξ of $\{1,2\}$, and there are isomorphisms $u_i : \mathcal{L}_i \to \mathcal{L}_{\xi(i)}$, such that for any atom, $u(p_1 \otimes p_2) = u_1(p_1) \otimes u_2(p_2)$ if $\xi = \mathsf{id}$ and $u(p_1 \otimes p_2) = u_2(p_2) \otimes u_1(p_1)$ otherwise.*

Proof. The first three steps of the proof are similar to those of the proof of Theorem 7.5 in [7]. We denote by $\{A_i^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \sigma_i}$ the connected coverings of Definition 3.6.

(1) **Claim**: For any atom $p = p_1 \otimes p_2$, we have $u(p_1 \otimes 1) = u(p)_1 \otimes 1$ or $u(p_1 \otimes 1) = 1 \otimes u(p)_2$. [*Proof*: Let $\gamma \in \sigma_2$ and q, $r \in A_2^\gamma$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is laterally connected, $p_1 \otimes q \vee p_1 \otimes r$ contains a third atom, so does $u(p_1 \otimes q) \vee u(p_1 \otimes r)$, for u is join-preserving and injective. Thus, by Lemma 3.13 part 1, $u(p_1 \otimes q)$ and $u(p_1 \otimes r)$ differ only by one component. As a consequence, one of the following cases holds: $u(p_1 \,\overline{\otimes}\, A_2^\gamma) \subseteq u(p)_1 \,\overline{\otimes}\, 1$, or $u(p_1 \,\overline{\otimes}\, A_2^\gamma) \subseteq 1 \,\overline{\otimes}\, u(p)_2$.

Define $f : \sigma_2 \to \{1, 2\}$ as $f(\gamma) = 1$ if the former case holds, and $f(\gamma) = 2$ if the latter case holds. Note that since u is injective, if $|A_2^\gamma \cap A_2^\delta| \geq 2$, then $f(\gamma) = f(\delta)$.

Let $\gamma_0 \in \sigma_2$ such that $p_2 \in A_2^{\gamma_0}$. Then, by the third hypothesis in Definition 3.2, for all $q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$, there is $\gamma \in \sigma_2$ such that $q \in A_2^\gamma$ and such that $f(\gamma) = f(\gamma_0)$. Hence, for all $q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$, we have $u(p_1 \otimes q)_{f(\gamma_0)} = u(p)_{f(\gamma_0)}$. As a consequence, either $u(p_1 \otimes 1) \leq u(p)_1 \otimes 1$ or $u(p_1 \otimes 1) \leq 1 \otimes u(p)_2$.

Suppose for instance that the former case holds. Then $p_1 \otimes 1 \leq u^{-1}(u(p)_1 \otimes 1)$, and since u^{-1} is also join-preserving and injective, $p_1 \otimes 1 = u^{-1}(u(p)_1 \otimes 1)$.]

(2) From part 1, we can define $g_2 : \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \overline{\otimes} \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2) \to \{1, 2\}$ as $g_2(p_1 \otimes p_2) = 2$ if $u(p_1 \otimes 1) = u(p)_1 \otimes 1$, and $g_2(p_1 \otimes p_2) = 1$ if $u(p_1 \otimes 1) = 1 \otimes u(p)_2$. We define g_1 in an obvious similar way (*i.e.* $g_1(p_1 \otimes p_2) = 1$ if and only if $u(1 \otimes p_2) = 1 \otimes u(p)_2$). **Claim**: The maps $p \mapsto g_i(p)$ are constant. [*Proof*: Let $p = p_1 \otimes p_2$ be an atom. Suppose that $g_2(p_1 \otimes p_2) = 2$. Whence, $u(p_1 \otimes 1) = u(p)_1 \otimes 1$. Let $\gamma_0 \in \sigma_1$ such that $p_1 \in A_1^{\gamma_0}$. Let $r \in A_1^{\gamma_0}$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is laterally connected, $p_1 \otimes p_2 \vee r \otimes p_2$ contains a third atom, say $t \otimes p_2$.

Let $v_2 \in T_2$. By Axiom P4, $p_1 \otimes v_2(p_2) \vee r \otimes v_2(p_2)$ contains $t \otimes v_2(p_2)$. Therefore, since $\mathcal{L}_2$ is transitive, we find that $t \otimes 1 \leq p_1 \otimes 1 \vee r \otimes 1$. Suppose now that $u(r \otimes 1) = 1 \otimes (u(r \otimes p_2))_2$. Then, by Lemma 3.13 part 2, we have

$$u(t \overline{\otimes} 1) \subseteq u(p)_1 \overline{\otimes} 1 \cup 1 \overline{\otimes} u(r \otimes p_2)_2 \,.$$

Therefore, $u(t \otimes 1) = u(p_1 \otimes 1)$ or $u(t \otimes 1) = u(r \otimes 1)$, a contradiction since u is injective.

As a consequence, for all $r \in A_1^{\gamma_0}$, $u(r \otimes 1) = u(r \otimes p_2)_1 \otimes 1$, hence $g_2(r \otimes p_2) = g_2(p_1 \otimes p_2)$. Now, by the third hypothesis in Definition 3.2, we find that $u(s \otimes 1) = u(s \otimes p_2)_1 \otimes 1$ for all $s \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$.]

(3) Let $p = p_1 \otimes p_2$ be an atom. From part 2, we can define a map $\xi : \{1, 2\} \to \{1, 2\}$ as $\xi(i) := g_i(p_1 \otimes p_2)$, and ξ does not depend on the choice of p. **Claim**: The map ξ is surjective. [*Proof*: Suppose for instance that $\xi(1) = 1 = \xi(2)$. Let $p = p_1 \otimes p_2$ and $q = q_1 \otimes q_2$ be atoms. Then

$$u(p)_2 = u(1 \otimes p_2)_2 = u(q_1 \otimes p_2)_2 = u(q_1 \otimes 1)_2 = u(q_1 \otimes q_2)_2 \,.$$

As a consequence, $u(1) \leq 1 \otimes u(p)_2$, a contradiction since u is surjective.]

(4) Let $p_1 \otimes p_2$ be an atom. For $i = 1$ and $i = 2$, define $U_i : \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_i) \to \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_{\xi(i)})$ as $U_1(p) := u(p \otimes p_2)_{\xi(1)}$ and $U_2(q) := u(p_1 \otimes q)_{\xi(2)}$. **Claim**: Those definitions do not depend on the the choice of $p_1 \otimes p_2$. [*Proof*: Suppose for instance that $\xi = \mathsf{id}$. Then for any atom r_2 of $\mathcal{L}_2$, we have

$$u(p \otimes p_2)_{\xi(1)} = u(p \otimes 1)_{\xi(1)} = u(p \otimes r_2)_{\xi(1)} \,.]$$

Define $u_i : \mathcal{L}_i \to \mathcal{L}_{\xi(i)}$ as $u_i(a_i) = \vee U_i(\mathcal{A}(a_i))$. **Claim**: The map u_i is an isomorphism. [*Proof*: Suppose for instance that $\xi = \mathsf{id}$. Let $a \in \mathcal{L}_1$. Then, since u and h_1 are join-preserving, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} u(h_1(a)) = u(h_1(\vee \mathcal{A}(a))) &= \vee\{u(h_1(r))\,;\, r \in \mathcal{A}(a)\} = \vee\{u(r \otimes 1)\,;\, r \in \mathcal{A}(a)\} \\ &= \vee\{u(r \otimes p_2)_1 \otimes 1\,;\, r \in \mathcal{A}(a)\} = \vee\{h_1(u(r \otimes p_2)_1)\,;\, r \in \mathcal{A}(a)\} \\ &= h_1(\vee\{u(r \otimes p_2)_1\,;\, r \in \mathcal{A}(a)\}) = h_1(\vee\{U_1(r)\,;\, r \in \mathcal{A}(a)\}) = h_1(u_1(a)) \,. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, since h_1 and u are injective, so is u_1. Let $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$. Then, by the preceding formula, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(u_1(\vee\omega)) &= u(h_1(\vee\omega)) = \vee\{u(h_1(a))\,;\, a \in \omega\} \\ &= \vee\{h_1(u_1(a))\,;\, a \in \omega\} = h_1(\vee\{u_1(a)\,;\, a \in \omega\}) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Whence, since h_1 is injective, u_1 preserves arbitrary joins. Finally, since U_1 is surjective, so is u_1. As a consequence, u_1 is a bijective map preserving arbitrary joins, hence an isomorphism.] $\square$

6. ORTHOCOMPLEMENTED S-PRODUCTS

For our main result, we need some additional hypotheses on $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$, which are true if $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ with $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ complex Hilbert spaces.

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a complete atomistic lattice and let $T \subseteq \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$. We say that $\mathcal{L}$ is *T−strongly transitive* if $\mathsf{id} \in T$, T acts transitively on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, and if

1. for all two $p \neq q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, there is $u \in T$ such that $u(p) = p$ and $u(q) \neq q$,
2. for all subset $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, we have:
   $[u(A) \cap A = u(A)$ or $\emptyset$, for all $u \in T] \Rightarrow [A = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ or A is a singleton$]$.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space. Then $\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H})$ is transitive. Moreover,*

1. *if $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \geq 3$, then $\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H})$ is $\mathsf{U}(\mathcal{H})$−strongly transitive,*
2. *if $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2$ and if the second hypothesis in Definition 6.1 holds for some nonempty subset $A \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^2 - 0)/\mathbb{C}$ and all $u \in \mathsf{U}(\mathbb{C}^2)$, then $A = \mathcal{A}(\mathsf{P}(\mathbb{C}^2))$, or A is a singleton, or $A = \{p, p^\perp\}$ with p an atom of $\mathsf{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$.*

Proof. Obviously, $\mathsf{U}(\mathcal{H})$ acts transitively on $\mathcal{A}(\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H})) = (\mathcal{H} - 0)/\mathbb{C}$, and on each coatom. Therefore, if $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \geq 3$, then the first assumption in Definition 6.1 holds.

We now check the second assumption of Definition 6.1. Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}))$ be a nonempty subset. Suppose that A is not a singleton. Let p, $q \in A$.

Assume first that $p \not\perp q$. Define

$$G_p := \{u \in \mathsf{U}(\mathcal{H})\,;\, u(p) = p\}\,,$$
$$p \cdot q := |\langle P, Q\rangle|\,,$$

where $P \in p$, $Q \in q$ and $\|P\| = \|Q\| = 1$. Moreover, for $\omega \subseteq [0, 1]$, define the cone

$$C_\omega(p) := \{r \in \mathcal{A}(\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H}))\,;\, p \cdot r \in \omega\}\,.$$

Since $p \in u(A) \cap A$, for all $u \in G_p$, we have $C_{p\cdot q}(p) \subseteq A$. Moreover, $C_{p\cdot r}(r) \subseteq A$, for all $r \in C_{p\cdot q}(p)$. Therefore, we find that $C_{[\lambda,1]}(p) \subseteq A$ where

$$\lambda = \max\{0, \cos(2\arccos(p \cdot q))\}\,,$$

and furthermore that $\mathcal{A}(\mathsf{P}(\mathcal{H})) \subseteq A$.

Suppose now that $p \perp q$. If $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \geq 3$, since $\dim(p^\perp)$ and $\dim(r^\perp)$ are ≥ 2, we find that $\lambda = 0$. Finally, if $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = 2$ and $A = \{p, p^\perp\}$, then $u(A) \cap A = \emptyset$ or $u(A)$, for all $u \in \mathsf{U}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. $\square$

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be complete atomistic lattices, with $\mathcal{L}_i$ T_i−strongly transitive for some $T_i \subseteq \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_i)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\mathsf{S}_{T_1T_2}$−product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$. Let $R \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ be nonempty, such that for all $u \in \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$, $u(R) \cap R = u(R)$ or $\emptyset$. Then one of the following cases holds.*

- (i) *$R = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$.*
- (ii) *R is a singleton.*
- (iii) *$R = p\,\overline{\otimes}\,\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$, for some $p \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$.*
- (iv) *$R = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)\,\overline{\otimes}\,q$ for some $q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$.*

Proof. (1) Let $p \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ and $q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$. Define

$$R(p) := \{s \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)\,;\, p \otimes s \in R\}\,,$$
$$R^{-1}(q) := \{r \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)\,;\, r \otimes q \in R\}\,.$$

Claim: If $R(p) \neq \emptyset$, then $R(p) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$ or $R(p) = \{s\}$ for some $s \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$. [*Proof*: Let $u_2 \in T_2$ such that $u_2(R(p)) \cap R(p) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\mathsf{id} \otimes u_2(R) \cap R \neq \emptyset$. Hence, by hypothesis, we have $\mathsf{id} \otimes u_2(R) \subseteq R$; therefore $u_2(R(p)) \subseteq R(p)$. As a consequence, the statement follows from the fact that $\mathcal{L}_2$ is T_2-strongly transitive.]

(2) Suppose that $p_1 \otimes p_2,\ q_1 \otimes q_2 \in R$. Then, since $\mathcal{L}_2$ is T_2-strongly transitive, there is $u_2 \in T_2$ with $u_2(p_2) = p_2$ and $u_2(q_2) \neq q_2$. As a consequence, $\mathsf{id} \otimes u_2(R) \cap R \neq \emptyset$, therefore, by hypothesis, $\mathsf{id} \otimes u_2(R) \subseteq R$. Hence, $\{q_2, u_2(q_2)\} \subseteq R(q_1)$. Thus, by part 1, we have $R(q_1) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$. In the same way, we prove that $R(p_1) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$. As a consequence, $|R^{-1}(y)| \geq 2$, for all $y \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$. Therefore, by part 1, $R^{-1}(y) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$, for all $y \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$, that is $R = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \,\overline{\otimes}\, \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$. ☐

Theorem 6.4. *Let $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ be complete atomistic lattices, with $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ coatomistic and weakly connected. Let $(T_1, T_2) \subseteq \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_2)$. Suppose that one of the following cases holds.*

- (i) *$\mathcal{L}_i$ is T_i-strongly transitive and $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\mathsf{S}_{T_1T_2}-$product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$.*
- (ii) *$\mathcal{L}_2$ is T_2-strongly transitive, $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathsf{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\mathsf{S}_{\mathsf{U}(\mathbb{C}^2)T_2}-$product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$.*
- (iii) *$\mathcal{L}_1$ is T_1-strongly transitive, $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathsf{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\mathsf{S}_{T_1\mathsf{U}(\mathbb{C}^2)}-$product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$.*
- (iv) *$\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathsf{P}(\mathbb{C}^2) = \mathcal{L}_2$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\mathsf{S}_{\mathsf{U}(\mathbb{C}^2)\mathsf{U}(\mathbb{C}^2)}-$product of $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$.*

If $\mathcal{L}$ admits an orthocomplementation, then $\mathcal{L}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$, and $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are orthocomplemented.

Proof. We denote the dual of $\mathcal{L}_i$ (defined by the converse order-relation) by $\mathcal{L}_i^*$. Hence $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_i^*)$ stands for the set of coatoms of $\mathcal{L}_i$.

Let $\perp\colon \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ be an orthocomplementation of $\mathcal{L}$. We define a map $\Delta : \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1^*) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2^*) \to \mathcal{L}$ as

$$\Delta(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes x_2)^{\perp} = h_1(x_1)^{\perp} \wedge h_2(x_2)^{\perp}\,.$$

Note that $0 \neq \Delta(x_1, x_2) \neq 1$, for all $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1^*) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2^*)$. Moreover, Δ is injective. We prove that the image of Δ is $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, and that Δ is a bijection. As a consequence, the map $f : \mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2 \to \mathcal{L}$ defined as $f(a) = \wedge\{\Delta(x_1, x_2)^{\perp}\,;\, a \subseteq \mathcal{A}(x_1) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2) \cup \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1) \times \mathcal{A}(x_2)\}$ is obviously an isomorphism. As consequence, $\mathcal{L}_1 \owedge \mathcal{L}_2$ is orthocomplemented. Therefore, $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are orthocomplemented (see Proposition 8.3, [7]). In the sequel, we denote $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1^*) \times \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2^*)$ by Ξ.

(1) **Claim**: For any two $x = (x_1, x_2)$, $y = (y_1, y_2) \in \Xi$, $\Delta(x) \wedge \Delta(y) = 0$. [*Proof*: Suppose for instance that $x_1 \neq y_1$, and let $a \leq \Delta(x) \wedge \Delta(y)$. Then $x_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes x_2 \vee y_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes y_2 \leq a^{\perp}$. Therefore, since h_1 preserves joins and 1, we have

$$1 = h_1(1) = h_1(x_1 \vee y_1) = h_1(x_1) \vee h_1(y_1) \leq a^{\perp}\,;$$

whence $a^{\perp} = 1$, that is $a = 0$.]

(2) **Claim**: For all $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \Xi$ and all $u \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$, there is $y \in \Xi$ such that $u(\Delta(x)) = \Delta(y)$. [*Proof*: First note that $u^{\perp} : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ defined as $u^{\perp}(a) = u(a^{\perp})^{\perp}$ is an automorphism of $\mathcal{L}$. By Theorem 5.1, there are two isomorphisms v_1 and v_2

and a permutation ξ such that for any atom, $u^{\perp}(p_1 \otimes p_2)_{\xi(i)} = v_i(p_i)$. Suppose for instance that $\xi = \mathsf{id}$. Then,

$$u(\Delta(x)) = (u^{\perp}(\Delta(x)^{\perp}))^{\perp} = (u^{\perp}(x_1 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes x_2))^{\perp} = (v_1(x_1) \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes v_2(x_2))^{\perp} \,,$$

hence $u(\Delta(x)) = \Delta(v_1(x_1), v_2(x_2))$.]

(3) **Claim**: $\cup\{\mathcal{A}(\Delta(x));\ x \in \Xi\} = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$. [*Proof*: Let $x \in \Xi$. By Axioms P5 and P4, $\mathcal{L}$ is transitive. As a consequence, for any atom r of $\mathcal{L}$, there is an automorphism u such that $r \le u(\Delta(x))$, hence by part 2, there is $y \in \Xi$ such that $r \le \Delta(y)$.]

(4) Consider assumption (i). **Claim**: For all $x \in \Xi$, $\Delta(x)$ is an atom. [*Proof*: Let $x^0 = (x_1^0, x_2^0) \in \Xi$. From part 2 and 1, $u(\Delta(x^0)) \wedge \Delta(x^0) = u(\Delta(x^0))$ or 0, for all $u \in \mathsf{Aut}(\mathcal{L})$. Therefore, by Lemma 6.3, either $\Delta(x^0)$ is an atom, or $\Delta(x^0) = r \otimes 1$ for some $r \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$, or $\Delta(x^0) = 1 \otimes s$ for some $s \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_2)$.

Suppose for instance that $\Delta(x^0) = r \otimes 1$. Then, since $\mathcal{L}_1$ is transitive, by part 2, for all $s \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$, there is $y \in \Xi$ such that $s \otimes 1 = \Delta(y)$, hence by part 1, for all $z \in \Xi$, there is $s \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ such that $\Delta(z) = s \otimes 1$. Therefore, there is a bijection $f : \Xi \to \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L}_1)$ such that $\Delta(x) = f(x) \otimes 1$, for all $x \in \Xi$.

Let $t \le \Delta(x^0)$ be an atom. By Axiom P2, since $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are coatomistic, we have that $\wedge\{\Delta(x)^{\perp};\ t \le \Delta(x)^{\perp}\} = t$; whence

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^0 \otimes 1 \vee 1 \otimes x_2^0 = \Delta(x^0)^{\perp} \le t^{\perp} &= \vee\{\Delta(x);\ t \le \Delta(x)^{\perp}\} \\ &= \vee\{f(x) \otimes 1;\ t \le \Delta(x)^{\perp}\} = a \otimes 1 \,, \end{aligned}$$

(with $a = \vee\{f(x)\,;\, t \le \Delta(x)^{\perp}\}$) a contradiction. As a consequence, $\Delta(x^0)$ is an atom.]

(5) Consider now assumption (ii). Suppose that none of the cases treated in part 4 holds for $\Delta(x_0)$. Then by the same argument as in Lemma 6.3, we find that $\mathcal{A}(\Delta(x_0)) = \{r, r^{\perp_1}\}\overline{\otimes}1$ or $\{r, r^{\perp_1}\}\overline{\otimes}s$ with r and s atoms. Both cases can be excluded from the last requirement in Definition 3.6.

(6) Finally, consider assumption (iv). The last case we have to exclude is $\mathcal{A}(\Delta(x_0)) = \{r \otimes s, r^{\perp_1} \otimes s^{\perp_2}\}$.

(6.1) Let $G := \mathsf{U}(\mathbb{C}^2) \times \mathsf{U}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. **Claim**: For all p, $q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, there is $(u_1, u_2) \in G$ such that $u_1 \otimes u_2(p^{\perp}) = q^{\perp}$. [*Proof*: Let g be the action of G on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ defined as $g(u_1, u_2)(p) = (u_1 \otimes u_2)^{\perp}(p)$ (see part 2). Let p and q be atoms of $\mathcal{L}$. Then there is $(u_1, u_2) \in G$ such that $u_1 \otimes u_2(p) = q$, thus $(u_1 \otimes u_2)^{\perp}(p^{\perp}) = q^{\perp}$. Hence, G acts transitively on the set of coatoms of $\mathcal{L}$.

Claim: G acts transitively on the set of coatoms of $\mathcal{L}_1 \textcircled{\wedge} \mathcal{L}_2$. [*Proof*: Let $x \ne y \in \Xi$. By Axiom P2, there are atoms r and s such that $\Delta(x)^{\perp} \le r^{\perp}$ and $\Delta(y)^{\perp} \le s^{\perp}$. By what precedes, there is $(u_1, u_2) \in G$ such that $(u_1 \otimes u_2)^{\perp}(r^{\perp}) = s^{\perp}$, hence $(u_1 \otimes u_2)^{\perp}(\Delta(x)^{\perp}) \le s^{\perp}$. Since by Theorem 5.1, $(u_1 \otimes u_2)^{\perp}$ factors, from part 1, $(u_1 \otimes u_2)^{\perp}(\Delta(x)^{\perp}) = \Delta(y)^{\perp}$.]

As a consequence, since $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are of length 2, the action of G on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$ is transitive. Therefore, for all p, $q \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$, there is $(u_1, u_2) \in G$ such that $u_1 \otimes u_2(p^{\perp}) = q^{\perp}$.]

(6.2) Let $p \in \mathcal{A}(\Delta(x_0))$, then $\Delta(x_0)^{\perp} \le p^{\perp}$. From part 6.1, for any coatom $q^{\perp} \ge \Delta(x_0)^{\perp}$, there is $(u_1, u_2) \in G$ such that $u_1 \otimes u_2(p^{\perp}) = q^{\perp}$. Therefore,

$$\{q^{\perp}\,;\, q^{\perp} \ge \Delta(x_0)^{\perp}\} = \{u_1 \otimes u_2(p^{\perp})\,;\, (u_1, u_2) \in G_{x_0}\} \,,$$

where $G_{x_0} := \{(u_1, u_2) \in G\,;\, (u_1(x_{01}), u_2(x_{02}) = x_0\}$. Whence,

$$\mathcal{A}(\Delta(x_0)) = \{u_1 \otimes u_2(p^{\perp})^{\perp}\,;\, (u_1, u_2) \in G_{x_0}\} \,.$$

If $\mathcal{A}(p^\perp)$ is invariant under the action of G_{x_0} (*i.e.* $u_1 \otimes u_2(p^\perp) = p^\perp$, for all $(u_1, u_2) \in G_{x_0}$), then $\Delta(x_0) = p \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{L})$.

Otherwise, write $\mathcal{A}(p^\perp)$ as

$$\mathcal{A}(p^\perp) = \bigcup_{\alpha\beta} c_\alpha(x_{01}) \,\overline{\otimes}\, c_\beta(x_{02}) \,,$$

where $c_\cdot(x_{0i})$ is included in the cone $C_\cdot(x_{0i})$ around x_{0i} (see the proof of Lemma 6.2). Now, if $\mathcal{A}(p^\perp)$ is not invariant under the action of G_{x_0}, then there is $c_\cdot(x_{0i})$ which is a proper subset of $C_\cdot(x_{0i})$. Therefore, obviously $\Delta(x_0)$ contains more than two atoms. ☐

Remark 6.5. Note that if $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are orthocomplemented and h_1 and h_2 preserve also the orthocomplementation, then for any atom, we have

$$(p_1 \otimes p_2)^\perp = (h_1(p_1) \wedge h_2(p_2))^\perp = h_1(p_1)^\perp \vee h_2(p_2)^\perp = h_1(p_1^{\perp_1}) \vee h_2(p_2^{\perp_2}) \,,$$

so that the proof is trivial. On the other hand, if we ask the u of Axiom P4 to be an ortho-automorphism, then for all $x \in \Xi$, we have $u_1 \otimes u_2(\Delta(x)) = \Delta(u_1(x_1), u_2(x_2))$, so that part 2 of the proof becomes trivial, and the proof does not require Theorem 5.1.

References

[1] D. Aerts. Description of many separated physical entities without the paradoxes encountered in quantum mechanics. *Found. Phys.*, 12(12):1131–1170, 1982.

[2] D. Aerts and I. Daubechies. Physical justification for using the tensor product to describe two quantum systems as one joint system. *Helv. Phys. Acta*, 51(5-6):661–675 (1979), 1978.

[3] G. Birkhoff and J. v. Neumann. The logic of quantum mechanics. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 37(4):823–843, 1936.

[4] N. Gisin. Propensities and the state-property structure of classical and quantum systems. *J. Math. Phys.*, 25(7):2260–2265, 1984.

[5] N. Gisin. Bell's inequality holds for all nonproduct states[1] *Phys. Lett. A*, 154(5-6):201–202, 1991.

[6] R. J. Greechie. On generating distributive sublattices of orthomodular lattices. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 67(1):17–22, 1977.

[7] B. Ischi. The semilattice, box, and lattice-tensor products in quantum logic. Submitted, available on `http://arxiv.org/abs/math.LO/0304350`.

[8] B. Ischi. Property lattices for independent quantum systems. *Rep. Math. Phys.*, 50(2):155–165, 2002.

[9] F. Maeda and S. Maeda. *Theory of symmetric lattices.* Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 173. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1970.

[10] C. Piron. *Foundations of quantum physics.* W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Advanced Book Program, Reading, Mass.-London-Amsterdam, 1976. Mathematical Physics Monograph Series, 19.

[11] S. Pulmannová. Coupling of quantum logics. *Internat. J. Theoret. Phys.*, 22(9):837–850, 1983.

[12] S. Pulmannová. Tensor product of quantum logics. *J. Math. Phys.*, 26(1):1–5, 1985.

[13] T. Watanabe. A connection between distributivity and locality in compound P-lattices. *J. Math. Phys.*, 44(2):564–569, 2003.

[14] T. Watanabe. Locality and orthomodular structure of compound systems. *J. Math. Phys.*, 45(5):1795–1803, 2004.

Boris Ischi, Laboratoire de Physique des Solides, Université Paris-Sud, Bâtiment 510, 91405 Orsay, France

E-mail address: `ischi@kalymnos.unige.ch`

---

[1] Abstract: We prove that any non-product state of two-particle systems violates a Bell inequality.